



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,191	03/31/2004	Amit Bagga	633-024US	7508
47912	7590	11/22/2010		
Avaya DEMONT & BREYER, LLC 100 COMMONS WAY, STE 250 HOLMDEL, NJ 07733			EXAMINER GYORFI, THOMAS A	
			ART UNIT 2435	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 11/22/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@dblawn.com

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/815,191	Applicant(s) BAGGA ET AL.	
	Examiner Thomas Gyorfi	Art Unit 2435	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thomas Gyorfi. (3) ____.

(2) Kiril Dimov (Applicant's representative). (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 15 November 2010.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-27.

Identification of prior art discussed: P-Synch (NPL), Wong (US 2005/0102534), Eitel (US 7043521).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Thomas Gyorfi/ Examiner, Art Unit 2435	
--	--

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant and Examiner discussed the prior art vs. the claimed invention - no agreement was reached. The Applicant also included some exhibits to demonstrate certain behavioral aspects of the Google search engine in an attempt to discredit the Examiner's argument that search engines at the time of the instant invention would not necessarily return results with every keyword in the query; however, the Examiner counters by noting that Applicant's exhibit reflects the Google search engine circa 2010. The Google search engine has historically been modified frequently to add new features as well as to prevent Search Engine Optimizers (SEOs) from gaming the search results by flooding the results page with bogus Web page URLs. Consequently, Examiner believes that the capabilities of Google circa 2010 have no bearing on the capabilities of Google circa the time of the instant invention, and thus the exhibits represent impermissible hindsight on the part of the Applicant. The Examiner has included evidence supporting this position: see the Wikipedia article for "search engine optimization", particularly "History" on page 3 detailing key modifications made to the Google search engine subsequent to the priority date of the instant invention. The Examiner also submits the October 2003 version of the Google Help page, which continues to support the Examiner's position that at the time of the instant invention the results returned by Google's search engine did necessarily include all keywords provided in the search query.

Update: Upon closer observation, the Examiner has noted that Applicant's attempt to demonstrate a search query producing extraneous results was itself flawed, as the Applicant failed to consider present-day Google's requirements for forming a proper search query. Examiner submits the Google Basic Search Help page from 11/15/10, wherein it is disclosed that Google circa 2010 typically ignores various punctuation marks when supplied within a query, including the "@" and "#" characters from Applicant's query ("Some basic facts", third bullet point). Thus, what Applicant actually demonstrated is a query comprising the keywords "w", "icr", "t1", and "david"; and as is clearly evident from Exhibit #1, *every* result returned comprises all four of those keywords. What Applicant should have done - and what the various Google help pages on record from 1999 to the present confirm - is to include the password character string within quotation marks, which compels Google to search for the exact phrase as written. Had Applicant done so, Applicant would have observed the expected result that the proposed password "w@icr#t1" cannot be correlated with the name "David"; Examiner includes the evidence herein. It is further noted that Google's rule on punctuation marks appears to be one of the many modifications made to the Google search engine subsequent to the priority date of the instant invention, as no evidence of it was found on the help pages of 1999 or 2003. Thus, for at least all of these reasons, the Examiner believes that Applicant's exhibits utterly fail to support Applicant's position - if not contradict Applicant's position outright - and should not be given weight when considering whether the prior art renders the claims obvious.